

benefiting the EPA-funded project.) The recipient's matching share may exceed 5 percent.

## II. Evaluation Criteria

Preproposals submitted in response to this notice will be evaluated on a competitive basis by an EPA review panel. The following factors, which are weighted by percentage as to their relative importance, will be considered in evaluating the preproposals:

### 1. Program Experience (25 percent)

a. Experience in the development of adult education courses, with emphasis on training individuals with limited education.

b. Experience in the delivery of health and safety course materials to individuals with limited or no English language skills.

c. Demonstrated ability to target the worker population.

### 2. Lead-Based Paint Abatement Worker Course Experience (30 percent)

a. Experience in the delivery of courses, including hands-on training, to lead-based paint abatement workers.

b. Experience in providing community-based training to lead-based paint abatement workers.

c. Demonstrated experience in the implementation and operation of health and safety training for lead-based paint abatement workers.

d. Qualifications of key personnel.

e. The number of students expected to be trained during the project period.

### 3. Project Management (25 percent)

a. Applicant's ability to provide appropriate program staff to the project.

b. Applicant's ability to provide space, equipment, staff time, and other resources required to carry out project responsibilities.

c. Extent to which the applicant has considered a management plan for the project, including the designation of a qualified program administrator.

### 4. Budget (20 percent)

Preproposals should include a detailed budget that specifies the amount of money to be used in all aspects of the proposed worker training, as well as the amount that is to be the non-Federal share (at least 5 percent of the total budget, excluding in-kind contributions). All budgets must include funding for a trip to EPA in Washington, DC to attend an information-sharing meeting for all award recipients. The ability of the applicant to derive a budget estimate that is appropriate to the scope of the project will be considered in the evaluation process. The proposed budget should be clearly justified and consistent with the intended use of the funds set forth in this notice.

## III. Application Procedures

The following materials must be provided by all applicants:

1. Documentation that proves the nonprofit status of the applicant.

2. Copies of any lead-related course material already being used by the applicant to teach the course. In addition, any applicants who have received EPA funds for lead worker training in any previous year's program must include in their preproposal a description of how those funds were used.

## IV. Acceptable Expenditures

Funds awarded must be spent on activities that directly result in increased numbers of well-trained lead-based paint abatement workers. Since EPA has funded the development of a model course curriculum for workers, the Agency does not wish to fund the development of new courses through this program.

The following lists provide examples of activities that will and will not be considered for funding. The list of acceptable activities is for guidance only; projects may be funded for acceptable activities other than those on the list.

Award recipients may use the monies for the following:

- a. Delivery of lead-based paint abatement worker courses.
  - b. Delivery of train-the-trainer courses.
  - c. Enhancement of hands-on training programs.
  - d. Monitoring and evaluating courses.
  - e. Limited purchasing of supplies.
  - f. Speakers' fees (expenses and travel).
  - g. Slide duplication.
  - h. Rental of facilities.
  - i. Limited purchase of audio/visual equipment.
  - j. Workers' tuition.
  - k. Limited printing and reproduction of materials and manuals.
  - l. Transporting workers to training sites.
  - m. Innovative training systems (i.e., community-based training).
- Monies may *not* be used for the following:
- a. Development of new training course curricula for workers.
  - b. Stipends to students for room, board, and salaries.

## V. Notification of Selection

Preproposals are due no later than May 15, 1995. Preproposals shall be no more than five pages in length. Each applicant is requested to provide seven copies of the preproposal to EPA. EPA plans to award a total of \$1.55 million

through cooperative agreements to eligible nonprofit organizations. EPA will not allot all of the available award money to any one group or necessarily fund all of the groups.

Dated: April 6, 1995.

Lynn R. Goldman,

Assistant Administrator for Prevention,  
Pesticides and Toxic Substances.

[FR Doc. 95-9164 Filed 4-12-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-F

[FRL-5190-3]

## Proposed De Minimis Settlement Under Section 122(g) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act; In the Matter of MacGillis & Gibbs/Bell Lumber & Pole Site, New Brighton, Minnesota

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Request for public comment.

**SUMMARY:** Notice of *De Minimis* Settlement: in accordance with Section 122(i)(1) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980, as amended ("CERCLA"), notice is hereby given of a *de minimis* settlement concerning relocation of a petroleum liquids transmission pipeline at the MacGillis & Gibbs/Bell Lumber & Pole Site in New Brighton, Minnesota. U.S. EPA Region 5 has submitted the proposed agreement to the U.S. Department of Justice, and the Assistant Attorney General has rendered her written approval. The work to be performed under this settlement agreement will commence after the public comment process set forth in Section 122(i)(1) of CERCLA has been completed.

**DATES:** Comments must be provided on or before May 15, 1995.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments should be addressed to Darryl Owens (Mail Code HSRM-6J), Remedial Project Manager, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois, 60604, and should refer to: In the Matter of MacGillis & Gibbs/Bell Lumber & Pole Site, Docket No. V-W-95-C-261.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Thomas M. Williams, (Mail Code CS-29A), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The United States and the State of Minnesota have entered into a *de minimis* settlement agreement with the Williams Pipe Line Company that

addresses the relocation of a petroleum liquids pipeline at the MacGillis & Gibbs/Bell Lumber & Pole Site ("the Site") in New Brighton, Minnesota. Among the areas to be addressed in response activities at the Site is a disposal pond area, where wood treating process wastes, including sludges and wood scraps containing creosote, pentachlorophenol and chromated copper arsenate, have been placed. The Williams Pipe Line Company operates a petroleum pipeline pursuant to license agreements with the various property owners at and adjacent to the site. The pipeline passes through the disposal pond area, and excavation and treatment of contaminated soils and sediments cannot proceed with the pipeline in place. Neither U.S. EPA nor the State of Minnesota presently has any evidence that Williams Pipe Line Company's operations resulted in the presence of the hazardous substances to be addressed in the disposal pond area. To the contrary, all available information indicates that the presence of these hazardous substances is attributable to adjacent wood treating operations.

U.S. EPA may enter into this settlement under the authority of Section 122(g) of CERCLA. The settlement agreement provides that Williams Pipe Line will obtain the necessary authority from other property owners to relocate its pipeline to a remote location, and proceed to re-route its pipeline accordingly pursuant to an approved work plan and schedule. Actual line relocation is not expected to take more than twenty days. U.S. EPA and the State of Minnesota have agreed to provide funding of up to \$198,415 for the project. Payment is to be made upon completion of the work and review of the relocation costs incurred.

A copy of the proposed Administrative Order on Consent and additional background information relating to the settlement are available for review and may be obtained in person or by mail from Thomas M. Williams (Mail Code CS-29A), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604.

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency will receive written comments relating to this settlement for thirty days from the date of publication of this notice.

Authority: The Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and

Liability Act of 1980, as amended, 42 U.S.C. Sections 9601 *et seq.*

Joseph M. Boyle,

*Acting Director, Waste Management Division.*

[FR Doc. 95-9058 Filed 4-12-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-M

## FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

### Network Reliability Council Meeting

April 7, 1995.

**AGENCY:** Federal Communications Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice of public meeting.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act, Public Law 92-463, as amended, this notice advises interested persons of the eleventh meeting of the Network Reliability Council ("Council"), which will be held at the Federal Communications Commission in Washington, D.C.

**DATES:** Friday, April 28, 1995 at 1:30 p.m.

**ADDRESSES:** Federal Communications Commission, Room 856, 1919 M Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20554.

**FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION CONTACT:** Robert Kimball at (202) 634-7150.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Council was established by the Federal Communications Commission to bring together leaders of the telecommunications industry and telecommunications experts from academic, consumer and other organizations to explore and recommended measures that would enhance network reliability.

The agenda for the eleventh meeting is as follows: the Council will receive an overview of Steering Committee activities and an update on network reliability performance. Progress reports will be made by three NRC focus group leaders and discussion will follow. The Council will also discuss data collection activities including funding problems.

Members of the general public may attend the meeting. The Federal Communications Commission will attempt to accommodate as many people as possible. However, admittance will be limited to the seating available. The public may submit written comments to the Council's designated Federal Officer before the meeting.

Federal Communications Commission.

William F. Caton,

*Acting Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 95-9041 Filed 4-12-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-M

[Gen. Docket No. 88-476; DA 95-590]

### Private Wireless Division, New York Metropolitan Area Public Safety Plan Amendment

**AGENCY:** Federal Communications Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Acting Chief, Private Radio Division and the Acting Chief, Spectrum Engineering Division released this Order affirming the November 28, 1994, amendment to the Public Safety Radio Plan for the New York Metropolitan Area (Region 8). As a result of affirming the amendment to the Plan for Region 8, the interests of the eligible entities within the region will be furthered.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** March 30, 1995.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Mark Rubin, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Private Wireless Division (202) 418-0680.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

Order

Adopted: March 22, 1995

Released: March 30, 1995

By the Acting Chief, Private Wireless Division, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau and the Acting Chief, Spectrum Engineering Division, Office of Engineering and Technology:

1. On November 28, 1994, the Private Radio Bureau and the Office of Engineering and Technology, acting under delegated authority, approved an amendment to the New York Metropolitan Area (Region 8) Public Safety Plan (Plan). *Order*, Gen. Docket No. 88-476, adopted November 28, 1994, DA 94-1329. In the *Order*, we inadvertently failed to note that Mr. Charles L. Larsen filed a timely comment on August 2, 1994.

2. We have reviewed Mr. Larsen's comment. Mr. Larsen opposed the amendment to the Region 8 Plan noting the scarcity of frequencies in the New York metropolitan area. We note that his objection is not directed against the proposed amendment, but rather the public safety National Planning process. We find that our approval of the amendment was consistent with Commission authority pursuant to *Report and Order*, in Gen. Docket No. 87-112, 53 FR 1022, January 15, 1988.

3. Accordingly, we reaffirm our decision of November 28, 1994, that the Public Safety Radio Plan for the New York Metropolitan Area (Region 8) IS AMENDED, as set forth in the Region's letter of July 11, 1994.

4. For further information, contact Mark Rubin at (202) 418-0680.